

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **27 November 2006**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17 and 19-28. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17, and 19-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bly et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0077944, hereinafter "Bly."), in view of Holt et al. (USPN 6,601,061 hereinafter "Holt"), and further in view of Harris (US Pub. No. 2002/0059204 hereinafter "Harris").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bly in view of Holt, and further in view of Harris.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention teaches determining if the search for information is to be conducted **only locally, locally and remotely, or only remotely** (see page 8, lines 7-10, of the instant application). Based on this determination, the system then proceeds further with the search itself. This prior determination is beneficial because it permits organizational procurement controls to be in place to direct the nature of the search, thereby enabling further control over the access of information to a user.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in Bly, Holt, or Harris, either separately, separately or in concert, that teaches a mechanism for controlling the nature of the search itself.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 to clarify that the present invention teaches determining if the search is to be local and/or remote, and proceed with the search based on the results of this determination. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 7-10, of the

instant application. Dependent claims 9, 10, and 11 have been amended to reflect correct claim dependencies. New dependent claims 29-31 have been added. These find support in page 12, lines 4-9, FIG. 2, state 210, and lines 10-15, page 13 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6, 9-11, 13, 26, 29, and 30, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, 27, and 31, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, and 28 which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 25 January 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com